

Course Evaluation

Course: **Philosophy of Computer Science, CD5650**

Date: 2004, period 3

Course leader: Gordana Dodig-Crnkovic

Lecturers: Luciano Floridi, Lars-Göran Johansson, Erik Sandewall, Björn Lisper, Jan Gustafsson, Kimmo Eriksson, Peter Funk, Gordana Dodig-Crnkovic

Course Objectives and Content

Were the course objectives clearly stated?	4,50
Were the objectives achieved?	4,58
Were the topics presented relevant to you?	4,25
Was the course structured in a logical way?	4,33
Was the course easy to follow?	4,25
Was the course interesting and enjoyable?	4,58
How would you grade paper writing part in the course?	4,17

Your comments:

“easy” does not mean simple or little work, but there were no practical obstacles like late information.

It was very good to have to write a paper. But it could be scheduled later in the course

“Easy to follow”: it was challenging, which it should be, but easy in the more practical sense, planning was good etc.

Course Textbook and Materials

How good was the course text book <i>The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Computing and Information</i> , Luciano Floridi (Editor)?	4,00
Was the PI course web page useful and well-maintained?	5,00
Are the course materials easy to read?	3,91
Will you be able to use the course materials as a reference?	3,83

Please give your comments on the book

Parts are probably too advanced, but as a whole it is a very good book for the course.

Enormously interesting, but I think it gives quite biased views of concepts such as knowledge etc. I would have liked a larger diversity among the “voices” in the book.

Some chapters are very challenging to read. Probably because I lack the background expertise of those studying philosophy and similar subjects.

Quite hard to read, but that is the way it should be!

Please give your comments on the other course material (PI-web page)

Very good

Very good with a large number of links to additional material.

The same as for the book.

A wonderful resource with all links. Also, it provided all necessary information. Please: can it be maintained & continue to exist? The links are so good!!

Guest Lectures

Please grade the lecture <i>Introduction to PI</i> by Luciano Floridi	4,58
<p>Your comments</p> <p>Interesting topic. Good presenter .-</p> <p>The lecture was very interesting, but the discussions were sometimes difficult for me to follow.</p> <p>Interesting, but covered too many “open problems”. Could have been more “basic”. Started a very rewarding and exciting discussion.</p> <p>Enormously inspiring teacher.-Good at discussing and communicating with class.</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>Physics as an “Ideal Science” - Philosophical Foundations and Consequences</i> by Lars-Göran Johansson	3,50
<p>Your comments</p> <p>Interesting topic. Very slow presentation, old-fashioned. To some extent a cultural difference between humanities and technology. Hard to see structure – but there probably was one. –</p> <p>Misleading title.</p> <p>Quite some overlap with research methodology course.</p> <p>It was not about physics!</p> <p>Good questions. No answers.</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>The Function of Natural Laws in Physics</i> by Lars-Göran Johansson	3,58
<p>Your comments</p> <p>It was not about topic. Also he spent a lot of time on real “självklarheter”, like induction. Also he did not state clearly his starting points for the view of science, it was implicit.</p> <p>Unusually classical style.</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>Philosophical Foundations of Computability</i> by Gordana Dodig-Crnkovic	4,55
<p>Your comments</p> <p>Lots of interesting info.</p> <p>A little too hurried. Sieve the material.</p> <p>Very interesting but maybe a bit too much content.</p> <p>Nice & capturing presentation.</p>	

Please grade the lecture <i>Methodological Foundations of Computer Science</i> by Erik Sandewall	4,50
<p>Your comments</p> <p>All of the set goals were not given clear answers.</p> <p>The best lecture of all!</p> <p>Very interesting discussion on problems and methodology, open for discussion. Perhaps a bit unstructured</p> <p>This lecturer provided some views on methodology for systems development research which I missed in the research methodology course..</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>Critical Analysis of CS Methodology</i> by Jan Gustafsson	4,17
<p>Your comments</p> <p>A little too simplified examples/categories. —</p> <p>I liked the group discussion afterwards.</p> <p>Overlap with methodology course.</p> <p>Interesting, but the lecture was a bit non-understanding towards some questions & differing views.</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>Critical Analysis of CS Methodology</i> by Björn Lisper	4,25
<p>Your comments</p> <p>Same as above</p>	

Please grade the lecture <i>Methodological and Philosophical Aspects of Modelling</i> by Kimmo Eriksson	4,68
<p>Your comments</p> <p>Very entertaining and enthusiastic lecturer. Many good points</p> <p>Kimmo had great examples.</p> <p>Kimmo is an exceptionally good speaker.</p> <p>Interesting discussion problems versus models.</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>Methodological and Philosophical Aspects of Modelling</i> by Lars-Göran Johansson	3,50
<p>Your comments</p> <p>It was difficult for me to “hånga med” in this lecture.</p> <p>Mycket intressanta frågeställningar, men tycker föreläsaren har litet “fyrkantig” inställning till avvikande synsätt.</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>Computers in Society (Ethics, Internet Culture, Art)</i> by Gordana Dodig-Crnkovic	4,50
<p>Your comments</p> <p>-Interesting. Each part (especially art) could have been longer.</p> <p>Very interesting! It was the whole ethics course in two hours!</p> <p>Interesting, in particular the Ethics part, very nicely presented.</p> <p>Maybe too many topics covered, the art part I think could have been an own topic, it led to interesting discussion about art and science</p>	
Please grade the lecture <i>AI and Ethics</i> by Peter Funk	4,00
<p>Your comments</p> <p>-Cool SF-perspective! A bit unstructured. Good to discuss where the limits are of what is possible/impossible. Interesting examples from medicine.</p> <p>Interesting!</p> <p>Good presentation, but I think a lot of it concerned “exotic” & un-realistic topics like the rights of intelligent robots. I missed the discussion of all the ethical questions that are burning in today’s AI applications, such as effects & consequences of expert systems on e.g. tacit knowledge, and trust in knowledge.</p>	

General: To what degree...

Were your expectations met?	4,42
Were you encouraged to actively participate during the course?	4,67
Were your individual questions discussed to your satisfaction?	4,50
How would you rate the in-class discussions?	4,42
How would you describe the competence of lecturers in general?	4,58
Do you feel you have gained new knowledge with the course?	4,50
Would you recommend the course to others?	4,50
Do you believe the skills you have learned will help in your professional life?	4,00
Was the communication with the course leader good?	4,92
Did you feel comfortable during the course?	4,92
Did you like the course time frame?	4,42
Do you think the course was good value for the time invested?	4,50

Average total for the course: 4,53

Your comments, suggestions, ideas. Any topics you would recommend to include in future courses?

I liked the division of lectures into blocks; you stay more alert that way.

This type of course should be compulsory!

It is very interesting topic.

Very good course. It opened my eyes for whole new world I was not at all aware of before.

I do not want it to end! For me and my research it has been perfect – combining CS and philosophy and also other areas.

It has given rise to many ideas, thoughts and knowledge to follow up in my research.
THANKS!